

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/600,281 | 06/20/2003 | Peter Strarup Jensen | SUNMP155 | 6348 |
| | 7590 10/19/200 NILLA & GENCAREI | EXAMINER | | |
| 710 LAKEWAY DRIVE SUITE 200 SUNNYVALE, CA 94085 | | | NGUYEN, DUSTIN | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | 2154 | | |
| | | | | - |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 10/19/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | _ |
|-------------------------|---------|---|
| | X | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | ŀ | |
| ldress | | |
| 0) DAYS, | | |
| ommunication. | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| e merits is | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| FR 1.121(d). ΓΟ-152. | • | |
| | • | |
| | - | |
| Stage | | |
| |) :- | |
| | | |
| | | |

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 055 | 10/600,281 | JENSEN ET AL. | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | Dustin Nguyen | 2154 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply | n appears on the cover sheet w | th the correspondence address | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILIN - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 Cl after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communicatic - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory p - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | G DATE OF THIS COMMUNION FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a right. Beriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON statute, cause the application to become AB | CATION. reply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | |
| Status | | • | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | 30 July 2007. | | | | | |
| 2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ | This action is non-final. | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice und | der <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D |). 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | • | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | • | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction a | nd/or election requirement. | | | | | |
| Application Papers | · | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exa | miner | · | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | by the Examiner | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co | | · | | | | |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | • | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for | reign priority under 35 U.S.C. § | ; 119(a)-(d) or (f). | | | | |
| a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| dee the attached detailed office action for a | a hat of the certified copies not | Toocived. | | | | |
| | | · . | | | | |
| Attachment/c) | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview S | Summary (PTO-413) | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) Notice of I | nformal Patent Application | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date U.S. Patent and Trademark Office | 6) Other: | · | | | | |
| | ice Action Summary | Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20071010 | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 - 20 are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 09/04/2007 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 07/30/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. As per remarks, Applicant's argued that (1) Mehta does not have the option of restricting granularity of what services the client device wishes to discover and receive from the server.
- 5. As to point (1), Mehta discloses a Personal Access List (PAL) wherein a subscriber's PAL is the list of applications that the subscriber desires to have the MAS display on the

Application/Control Number: 10/600,281 Page 3

Art Unit: 2154

subscriber's device during application discovery [i.e. restricting granularity of what services the client device wishes to discover and receive] [paragraphs 0116, 0117, 0119 and 0120].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - A. The claim language in the following claims is not clearly explained:
 - I. As per claims 1, 9 and 17, the claimed limitation of "the client device is configured to restrict granularity of provisioning services requested from the provisioning server" should be part of the discover transactions since the restriction applies for the reply to a service discovery request [specification, page 16, lines 1-page 17, lines 24], not part of the delivery transaction as the claimed language as written and the Applicant's argument, pages 8 and 9. Therefore, the claimed language as written is being considered as indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Art Unit: 2154

- 8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 9. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mehta et al. [US Patent Application No 2002/0131404], in view of Kloba et al. [US Patent No 6,341,316].
- 10. As per claim 1, Mehta discloses the invention as claimed including a computer readable medium in which a provisioning application is stored, the provisioning application including program instructions which when read by a computer system, cause the computer system to perform a method for provisioning services between a client and a provisioning server [i.e. methods and systems for maintaining and provisioning wireless applications] [Figure 1; Abstract; paragraphs 0005 and 0012], comprising the operations of:

providing discovery transactions that allow the client device to retrieve information regarding services available to the client device from a provisioning server [i.e. the MAS to retrieve a list of available applications that can be downloaded to the subscriber's device, this is referred to application discovery] [Figure 4; and paragraphs 0006, 0067 and 0070], wherein a service comprises a plurality of content files capable of being installed on the client device [i.e. installation or uninstallation of applications on the wireless device] [paragraphs 0063 and 0064

affording subscription transactions that allow the client device to manage content in service directories [i.e. a Personalization Website, which is used by subscribers to order, ... and to manage applications] [paragraphs 0091, 0115 and 0116], wherein a service directory comprises a plurality of services [paragraphs 0091, 0131]; and

the client device is configured to restrict granularity of provisioning services requested from the provisioning server [i.e. the list of applications that the subscriber desires to have during application discovery] [paragraphs 0116, 0117, 0119 and 0120].

Mehta does not specifically disclose

providing delivery transactions that allow the client device to download data related to services based on synchronization of the client device with the provisioning server, wherein the synchronization ensures that view of delivered services on the client is in synchronization with the view of the delivered services on the provisioning server.

Kloba discloses

providing delivery transactions that allow the client device to download data related to services based on synchronization of the client device with the provisioning server [i.e. the web synchronization module controls synchronization of web content to client] [Figures 1I1 and 1I2; col 9, lines 1-14; and col 14, lines 46-53], wherein the synchronization ensures that view of delivered services on the client is in synchronization with the view of the delivered services on the provisioning server [i.e. data on the client and server are the same] [col 5, lines 29-40; and col 19, lines 33-col 20, lines 3].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Mehta and Kloba because the teaching of Kloba on synchronization

Application/Control Number: 10/600,281

Art Unit: 2154

would enable applications available via a network or via an Internet/intranet to download and to run on mobile devices and manage the variables relevant to a mobile device/server environment [Kloba, col 4, lines 45-52].

Page 6

- 11. As per claim 2, Mehta discloses wherein the discovery transactions includes a service discovery transaction that allows the client device to obtain information regarding a particular service [i.e. application discovery returns a list of content that can be downloaded that match criteria] [Figure 4; and paragraphs 0006 and 0067].
- 12. As per claim 3, Mehta discloses wherein the discovery transactions include a service directory discovery transaction that allows the client device to obtain information regarding a particular service directory [i.e. A subscriber's Personal Access List is the list of applications that the subscriber desires to have the MAS display during application discovery] [paragraphs 0016, 0019 and 0020].
- 13. As per claim 4, Mehta discloses wherein the subscription transactions include a service subscription transaction that allows a service to be added to a service directory [i.e. adding applications] [Figures 11E-H; paragraphs 0116 and 0117].
- 14. As per claim 5, Mehta discloses wherein the subscription transactions include an unsubscribe transaction that allows a service to be removed from a service directory [i.e. removing applications] [Figure 11J; and paragraphs 0116 and 0118].

Art Unit: 2154

- 15. As per claim 6, Mehta discloses wherein the delivery transactions include an update transaction that allows that allows the client device to obtain a provisioning update comprising a list of services that should be installed on the client device [i.e. a list of new applications that can be potentially downloaded] [paragraph 0063].
- 16. As per claim 7, Mehta discloses wherein the delivery transactions include a notification transaction that allows the provisioning server to request the client device to perform an update transaction [i.e. a notification that an updated version is available] [paragraphs 0063 and 0110].
- 17. As per claim 8, Mehta discloses wherein the delivery transactions include a delivery transaction that allows the client device to download data related to a service [i.e. send the packaged application to the requesting subscriber device] [310, Figure 3; and paragraphs 0070 and 0131].
- 18. As per claims 9-16, they are method claimed of claims 1-8, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-8.
- 19. As per claims 17-20, they are apparatus claimed of claims 1-8, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-8.

Art Unit: 2154

20. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154